



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/987,529

11/15/2001

Yasuhiro Hino

03500.015947.

7272

5514

7590

01/29/2009

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, MADELEINE ANH VINH

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2625

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/29/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/987,529	Applicant(s) HINO, YASUHIRO	
	Examiner Madeleine AV Nguyen	Art Unit 2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 December 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,6-8,17,19,22-24,48 and 49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,6-8,17,19,22-24,48 and 49 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, see pages 8-9, filed December 15, 2008, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1, 3, 6-8, 17, 19, 22-24, 48 and 49 under 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Nehab et al (US Patent No. 6,029,182) in view of Rogers et al (US Patent No. 5,793,964), Vidyanand (US Publication No. 2006/0023246).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 3, 6-8, 17, 19, 22-24 and 48-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nehab et al (US Patent No. 6,029,182) in view of Rogers et al (US Patent No. 5,793,964).

Concerning claim 1, Nehab discloses a printing system (Fig.1) connected via a network, to an external apparatus storing data (34, Fig.4 or 6) comprising a receiving unit (2, 11, 12, 13, 16, 19 Fig.1 or 2; Fig.9) adapted to receive acquisition information indicating data to be acquired and layout information necessary for assigning an image based on the acquired data to a

Art Unit: 2625

recording medium having a predetermined size (size of the document, size of a page), the acquisition information and the layout information being input by a user; a sending unit (16, Fig.4) adapted to send the acquisition information and the layout information (URLs, user-defined rules, extraction rules, web commands, structure criteria, content-based criteria, etc.) received by the receiving unit to the external apparatus (34) via the network so as to cause the external apparatus to acquire the data in accordance with the sent acquisition information and generating printing data; an acquisition unit (17, Fig.6) adapted to acquired the printing data generated by the external apparatus; and a printing unit (7, Fig.1) adapted to print the printing data acquired by the acquisition unit, wherein the external apparatus (34) generates the printing data by formatting, based on the layout information, the data corresponding to the acquisition information from the stored data (Abstract; col. 3, lines 50-64; col. 6, lines 47-50; col. 7, lines 5-10, lines 50-65; col. 8, line 27 – col. 9, lines 45; col. 10, line 60 – col. 11, line 15; col. 11, lines 36-40; col. 11, line 61 – col. 12, line 16; col. 13, line 43 - col. 14, line 35; Appendices 2 and 3).

Nehab does not directly teach that the printing system in Fig.1 is a printer. However, From Fig.3 of the application, the printer 1000 includes formatter controller 1100 which is defined as “not constituted by an actual hardware but by a computer system including a CPU, a ROM, and a RAM etc.” (Specification in page 12, lines 17-19). Thus, the printer 1000 includes a formatter controller 1100 which is a computer system. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to consider the printing system 1 (Fig.1) in Nehab a printer since the printing system 1 also includes a computer system (including a CPU 8, ROM/RAM 14, 5) connected to a network 11a and a printer engine 7 as shown in Fig.3 of the application.

Art Unit: 2625

Nehab et al does not directly disclose that the external apparatus generates printing data by formatting based on the layout information and the data corresponding to the acquisition information from the stored data. Rogers discloses a system (Figs. 1, 2, 7, 8) which allows (web) users to request information that is created by a data interpretation system (DIS) and then presented by a (web) server to the user of the web wherein the result can be furnished to a user at a specified location with a form and format desired (Abstract; col. 4, line 33 – col. 5, line 25; col. 10, lines 5-9; col. 15, lines 61-67). For instance, the system allow the facility for providing specialized specific requests to be created for routine use, as well as the facility to formulate generalized or specialized ad hoc requests. In addition the system allow query and update capability, the ability to perform calculations with respect to any retrieval data, to format the information in text or in graphics, and the facility of presenting the results to the client for displaying or other use (col. 5, line 16-25). The output can be routed to a requestor selected resulting output units, comprising fax, printer. retail or banking (col. 14, lines 58-62). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the above teaching of Rogers to generate printing data in a desired format based the web server that can generate printing data in a printable format to the external apparatus in Nehab et al since both of them teach a system for retrieving and printing network documents through network communications in a desired format.

Concerning claims 3, 6-7, 19, 22-23, Nehab in view of Rogers further teaches the acquisition information is represented by URL (44, Fig.9A), (claims 3, 19); the layout information includes information on the recording medium (claim 6) and the layout information is information designating a page and the acquisition unit acquires the printing data

Art Unit: 2625

corresponding to the designated page (maximum pages, maximum size, formatting rules, extraction specification limits for levels, pages, size, paragraph formatting, style sheets, headers and footers, etc. in Appendices 2 and 3), (col. 9, lines 4-7; col. 9, line 63 – col. 10, line 13; col. 11, lines 12-15; appendices 2 and 3), (claim 7). It is noted that the personal-news-profile-editor 16 and personal-news-profiles 19 can receive input from user to set or change the layout or format including information designating a page or information on the recording medium as a matter of well known in the prior art (col. 1, lines 18-35) and from the appendices 2 and 3 in Nehab.

Concerning claims 8, 24, Nehab in view of Rogers further teaches the data acquired by the external apparatus is described with a structured description language and wherein the structured description language is XML or HTML (18, Fig.2), (claims 8, 24).

Claim 17 is method claim of apparatus claim 1. Claim 17 is rejected for the same rationales set forth for claim 1.

Concerning claim 48, Nehab discloses a printing system (Fig.1) connected via a network, to a Web server holding plural Web pages (35, Fig.4 or 6) comprising a receiving unit (2, 11, 12, 13, 16, 19 Fig.1 or 2; Fig.9) adapted to receive a URL indicating the Web page to be acquired and layout information necessary for assigning an image based on the acquired data to a recording medium having a predetermined size (size of the document, size of a page), the acquisition information and the layout information being input by a user; a sending unit (16, Fig.4) adapted to send the URL and the layout information (user-defined rules, extraction rules, web commands, structure criteria, content-based criteria, etc.) received by the receiving unit to the Web server (35) via the network; an acquisition unit (17, Fig.6) adapted to acquired the

Art Unit: 2625

printing data generated by the Web server; and a printing unit (7, Fig.1) adapted to print the printing data acquired by the acquisition unit, wherein the Web server (34) generates the printing data by formatting, based on the layout information, the Web page corresponding to the URL from among the plural held Web pages (Abstract; col. 3, lines 50-64; col. 6, lines 47-50; col. 7, lines 5-10, lines 50-65; col. 8, line 27 – col. 9, lines 45; col. 10, line 60 – col. 11, line 15; col. 11, lines 36-40; col. 11, line 61 – col. 12, line 16; col. 13, line 43 - col. 14, line 35; col. 15, lines 29-39; col. 16, line 21 – col. 17, line 18; col. 18, line 54 – col. 19, line 23; Appendices 2 and 3).

Nehab does not directly teach that the printing system in Fig.1 is a printer. However, From Fig.3 of the application, the printer 1000 includes formatter controller 1100 which is defined as “not constituted by an actual hardware but by a computer system including a CPU, a ROM, and a RAM etc.” (specification in page 12, lines 17-19). Thus, the printer 1000 includes a formatter controller 1100 which is a computer system. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to consider the printing system 1 (Fig.1) in Nehab a printer since the printing system 1 also includes a computer system (including a CPU 8, ROM/RAM 14, 5) connected to a network 11a and a printer engine 7 as shown in Fig.3 of the application.

Nehab et al does not directly disclose that the Web server 14 generates printing data by formatting based on the layout information and the data corresponding to the acquisition information from the stored data. The same discussion is repeated as in claim 1 above.

Claim 49 is method claim of apparatus claim 48. Claim 49 is rejected for the same rationales set forth for claim 48.

Art Unit: 2625

3. Claims 26, 28, 46 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nehab in view of Rogers et al (US Patent No. 5,793,964) and Vidyanand (US Publication No. 2006/0023246).

Concerning claims 26 and 28, Nehab in view of Rogers et al discloses the printing method as disclosed in claim 17 above. Nehab further teaches the step of changing the received layout information (16, Fig.2) (col. 8, lines 12-18; col. 9, line 62 – col. 10, line 13; col. 18, lines 54-64).

Nehab in view of Rogers et al discloses that the received layout information can be changed but does not specifically teach that the changing of the received layout information on the recording medium having a first size to layout information having a second size different from the first size or the information on the recording medium is information indicating a sheet size. However, it was commonly known in the prior art that the layout information of the recording medium can be changed due to different recording medium sizes available for each printer. In the same field of endeavor, Vidyanand supports that prior art by disclosing, “Selected file specific options may be selected paper size (e.g., letter, legal, A4), ...” (paragraph 0003), “the user may also modify a previously defined set 16 ... and save the modified set as a new set 16 (e.g. modifying the selected page size and finishing preferences 18 for "Newsletter 1" and retaining the color preferences for "newsletter 1," and saving the modified set 16 as “proposal 1”), (paragraph 0045). Vidyanand further teaches in Fig.9 the page size selection menu (47a) for selecting different sizes of recording paper. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the step of changing the layout information from a first recording paper size to a second recording paper size as taught in Vidyanand since Nehab

Art Unit: 2625

also teaches the changing of the layout and format information without limiting the changing of the paper size.

Concerning claim 46, Nehab in view of Rogers et al further teaches a changing unit (16, Fig.2) adapted to change the layout and format information.

Nehab in view of Rogers et al does not specifically teach that in a case where paper size indicated by the layout information received by the receiving unit is not provided in the printer, the layout information is changed to the layout information indicating a size of paper provided in the printer. However, it was commonly known in the prior art that the layout information of the recording medium can be changed due to different recording medium sizes available for each printer. In the same field of endeavor, Vidyanand supports that prior art by disclosing, "Selected file specific options may be selected paper size (e.g., letter, legal, A4),..." (paragraph 0003), "the user may also modify a previously defined set 16 ... and save the modified set as a new set 16 (e.g. modifying the selected page size and finishing preferences 18 for "Newsletter 1" and retaining the color preferences for "newsletter 1," and saving the modified set 16 as "proposal 1"), (paragraph 0045). Vidyanand further teaches in Fig.9 the page size selection menu (47a) for selecting different sizes of recording paper. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the step of changing the layout information from a first recording paper size to a second recording paper size as taught in Vidyanand since Nehab also teaches the changing of the layout and format information without limiting the changing of the paper size.

Claim 47 is method claim of apparatus claim 46. Claim 47 is rejected for the same rationales set forth for claim 46.

Art Unit: 2625

Conclusion

Claims 1, 3, 6-8, 17, 19, 22-24, 48 and 49 are rejected.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Madeleine AV Nguyen whose telephone number is 571 272-7466. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward L. Coles can be reached on 571 272-7402. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Madeleine AV Nguyen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2625

Madeleine AV Nguyen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2625

January 29, 2009